

REMARKS

Applicants are proposing to amend claims 32 and 70 to clarify that the silencing can be detected in cellular material of a mammalian organism. Support for this amendment is found, for example, in the discussion beginning on page 3, at line 30, and continuing to page 4, at line 2. As noted there, the samples tested may be only part of the organism but include cellular material therefrom. Thus, the specification envisions detecting silencing simply in cellular material of mammalian organisms. Applicants appreciate the telephonic indication that this amendment would be acceptable if support is provided.

As no new matter is added, entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

Applicants also wish to clarify that as noted in claim 32 confirming that the target gene has been silenced does not necessarily imply a separate and distinct step from the process of detecting said silencing. No specific separate activity is required.

Applicants understand from a voicemail message from Examiner Bowman that the species election in the present case will not be converted to a restriction requirement.

Applicants sincerely appreciate the allowance of these claims and the consideration provided them by Examiner's Bowman and Schultz.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket No. 616292000110.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 5, 2010

By: _____ / Kate H. Murashige /
Kate H. Murashige
Registration No.: 29,959
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
12531 High Bluff Drive, Suite 100
San Diego, California 92130-2040
Telephone: (858) 720-5112